REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action dated April 17, 2007.

Claim 16, 18, and 31 are amended, claims 36-38 are added, and no claims are canceled by this response; as a result, claims 1-38 are now pending in this application. Support for the amendments is found generally within the specification (*see* e.g., Para. 18).

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant's Form 1449, submitted March 31, 2006, was returned with the Examiner's Office Action, but two items were not initialed. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner return the completely initialed Form 1449 with his next action.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 16, 20-21, 23-25, 31-33 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for anticipation by Sullivan et al. (US 7,007,105, "Sullivan"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant cannot find any teaching in Sullivan of, among other things,

an XML document processing module, including a compression module configured to compress XML documents and to convert compressed XML documents into text so as to form compressed valid XML documents,

as recited in claim 16 and claim 31 and incorporated into claims 20, 21, 23-25, 32, 33, and 35.

Instead, Sullivan describes transmitting a compressed string of binary information. Systems receiving this binary representation decompress the binary stream.[1] Thus, Sullivan refers to transmitting binary information and does not teach or even suggest compressed valid XML documents because, as stated in the present application, valid XML documents cannot contain binary data.[2]

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 16, 20-21, 23-25, 31-33 and 35.

---

[1] Sullivan, col. 4 lines 60-63.
[2] Patent Application, ¶18.

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR § 1.111
Serial Number: 10/710,835
Filing Date: August 5, 2004
Title: METHOD FOR COMPRESSING XML DOCUMENTS INTO VALID XML DOCUMENTS

Page 7
Dkt: 977.066US1

§103 Rejection of the Claims

1.   Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sullivan as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Girardot et al. (US 2003/0023628, "Girardot"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

    Claim 17 depends on base claim 16. The Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness because, for example,

> an XML document processing module, including a compression module configured to compress XML documents and to convert compressed XML documents into text so as to form compressed valid XML documents,

as incorporated into claim 17 from base claim 16, is not shown in any of the cited references.

    Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 17.

2.   Claims 18-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sullivan and Girardot as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Tycksen, Jr. et al. (US 6,189,097, "Tycksen"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

    The proposed combination of Sullivan, Girardot and Tycksen fails to describe or suggest a "compression module [that] includes a binary to ASCII text encoding algorithm," for example, such as described and claimed by Applicant in claim 18.

    Additionally, claims 18 and 19 ultimately depend on base claim 16. As set forth above, Applicant believes base claim 16 to be allowable at least for the reason that Sullivan and Girardot fail to describe or suggest all of the elements of the base claim.

    Tycksen relates to Digital Certificates,[3] and refers to text-based content being "treated just as a text-based object but indicated as a binary-based object in the formatting provided."[4] Therefore, because objects are indicated as binary objects, Tycksen does not describe or suggest, "a compression module to compress XML documents into compressed valid XML documents," as recited in base claim 16.

    Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 18 and 19.

3.   Claims 22 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sullivan as applied to claims 16 and 31 above, and further in view of Ma et al. (US 2005/0063575, "Ma"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

---

[3] Tycksen, Abstract.
[4] Tycksen, col. 9 lines 16-21.

Claims 22 and 24 depend on base claim 16. The Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness because, for example,

> an XML document processing module, including a compression module
> configured to compress XML documents and to convert compressed XML
> documents into text so as to form compressed valid XML documents,

as incorporated into claims 22 and 24 from base claim 16, is not shown in any of the cited references.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 22 and 24.

4. Claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sullivan as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Hertling et al. (US 7,016,962, "Hertling")and Hsu et al. (US 2004/0205158, "Hsu"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 26 ultimately depends on base claim 16. The Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness because, for example,

> an XML document processing module, including a compression module
> configured to compress XML documents and to convert compressed XML
> documents into text so as to form compressed valid XML documents,

as incorporated into claim 26 from base claim 16, is not shown in any of the cited references.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 26.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 16, 20, 23, 31 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for anticipation by Imaura *(US 2003/0018446.)* Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant cannot find any teaching in Imaura of, among other things,

> an XML document processing module, including a compression module
> configured to compress XML documents and to convert compressed XML
> documents into text so as to form compressed valid XML documents,"

as recited in claim 16 and claim 31 and incorporated into claims 20, 23, and 33.

Instead, Imaura states that a "compression unit 2-5 compresses the separated text, and the combining unit 2-6 combines the compressed text and the ASN.1 transfer syntax to obtain encoded XML data."[5] Imaura also states,

> "At step 2-5, the text is compressed. The well known LZ77 method and the well known technique that is described in a subdivision of the background art are specifically employed for the compression."[6]

Thus, Imaura refers to transmitting encoded XML data compressed using LZ77. Such an approach produces files that contain binary information.[7] Therefore, Imaura does not teach or suggest compressed valid XML documents because, as stated in the present application, valid XML documents cannot contain binary data.[8]

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 16, 20, 23, 31 and 33.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

1.   Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imaura as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Girardot. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 17 depends on base claim 16. The Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness because, for example,

> an XML document processing module, including a compression module configured to compress XML documents and to convert compressed XML documents into text so as to form compressed valid XML documents,

as incorporated into claim 17 from base claim 16, is not shown in any of the cited references.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 17.

2.   Claims 18-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imaura and Girardot as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Tycksen. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

---

[5] Imaura, ¶0056.
[6] Imaura, ¶0174.
[7] *See*, e.g., Sullivan, col. 4 lines 53-63.
[8] Patent Application, ¶18.

The proposed combination of Imaura, Girardot and Tycksen fails to describe or suggest a "compression module [that] includes a binary to ASCII text encoding algorithm," for example, such as described and claimed by Applicant in claim 18.

Additionally, claims 18 and 19 ultimately depend on base claim 16. As set forth above, Applicant believes base claim 16 to be allowable at least for the reason that Imaura and Girardot fail to describe or suggest all of the elements of the base claim.

Tycksen relates to Digital Certificates,[9] and refers to text-based content being "treated just as a text-based object but indicated as a binary-based object in the formatting provided."[10] Therefore, because objects are indicated as binary objects, Tycksen does not teach or suggest, "a compression module to compress XML documents into compressed valid XML documents," as recited in base claim 16.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 18 and 19.

3.   Claims 21 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sullivan as applied to claims 16 and 31 above, and further in view of Saint-Hillarie et al. (US 2005/0138545, "Saint-Hillarie"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 21 and 25 ultimately depend on base claim 16. The Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness because, for example,

> an XML document processing module, including a compression module configured to compress XML documents and to convert compressed XML documents into text so as to form compressed valid XML documents,

as incorporated into claims 21 and 25 from base claim 16, is not shown in any of the cited references. Saint-Hillarie states that the compressed documents must be decompressed by the Micro-extractor prior to being transferred to the second device.[11] Thus, the compressed documents are not valid XML documents.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 21 and 25.

---

[9] Tycksen, Abstract.
[10] Tycksen, col. 9 lines 16-21.
[11] Saint-Hillarie, ¶0021.

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR § 1.111
Serial Number: 10/710,835
Filing Date: August 5, 2004
Title: METHOD FOR COMPRESSING XML DOCUMENTS INTO VALID XML DOCUMENTS

Page 11
Dkt: 977.066US1

4.   Claims 22 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imaura as applied to claims 16 and 31 above, and further in view of Ma. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 22 depends on base claim 16 and claim 34 depends on base claim 34. The Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness because, for example,

> a compression module configured to compress XML documents and to convert compressed XML documents into text so as to form compressed valid XML documents,

as incorporated into claim 22 from base claim 16, and incorporated into claim 34 from base claim 31 is not shown in any of the cited references.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 22 and 34.

5.   Claims 21, 24-25, 32 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imaura as applied to claims 16 above, and further in view of Sullivan. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 21, 24, and 25 ultimately depend on base claim 16, and claims 32 and 35 ultimately depend on base claim 31. The Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness because, for example,

> a compression module configured to compress XML documents and to convert compressed XML documents into text so as to form compressed valid XML documents,

as incorporated into claims 21, 24, and 25 from base claim 16, and incorporated into claims 32 and 35 from base claim 31 is not shown in any of the cited references.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 21, 24-25, 32 and 35.

6.   Claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imaura as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Hertling and Hsu. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 26 ultimately depends on base claim 16. The Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness because, for example,

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR § 1.111
Serial Number: 10/710,835
Filing Date: August 5, 2004
Title: METHOD FOR COMPRESSING XML DOCUMENTS INTO VALID XML DOCUMENTS

Page 12
Dkt: 977.066US1

a compression module configured to compress XML documents and to convert compressed XML documents into text so as to form compressed valid XML documents,

as incorporated into claim 26 from base claim 16 is not shown in any of the cited references.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 26.

New Claims

Claims 36-38 are new. Support for the new claims is found generally within the specification (*see* e.g., Para 25). Applicant respectfully requests entry of the claims for examination.

RESERVATION OF RIGHTS

In the interest of clarity and brevity, Applicant may not have addressed every assertion made in the Office Action. However, Applicant's silence regarding any such assertion does not constitute any admission or acquiescence. Applicant reserves all rights not exercised in connection with this response, such as the right to challenge or rebut any tacit or explicit characterization of any reference or of any of the present claims, the right to challenge or rebut any asserted factual or legal basis of any of the rejections, the right to swear behind any cited reference such as provided under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 or otherwise, or the right to assert co-ownership of any cited reference. Applicant does not admit that any of the cited references or any other references of record are relevant to the present claims, or that they constitute prior art. To the extent that any rejection or assertion is based upon the Examiner's personal knowledge, rather than any objective evidence of record as manifested by a cited prior art reference, Applicant timely objects to such reliance on Official Notice, and reserves all rights to request that the Examiner provide a reference or affidavit in support of such assertion, as required by MPEP § 2144.03. Applicant reserves all rights to pursue any cancelled claims in a subsequent patent application claiming the benefit of priority of the present patent application, and to request rejoinder of any withdrawn claim, as required by MPEP § 821.04.

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR § 1.111
Serial Number: 10/710,835
Filing Date: August 5, 2004
Title: METHOD FOR COMPRESSING XML DOCUMENTS INTO VALID XML DOCUMENTS

Page 14
Dkt: 977.066US1

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (612) 371-2172 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

ADAM D. DIRSTINE

By his Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 371-2172

Date ___June 28, 2007___   By ___Paul J. Urbanski___
Paul J. Urbanski
Reg. No. 58,351

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being filed using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this ___ day of June 2007.

CANDIS BUENDING

_____   _____
Name   Signature